



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,967	11/21/2001	Travis J. Parry	10008078-1	1662

7590 09/07/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SCUDERI, PHILIP S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,967

Applicant(s)

PARRY, TRAVIS J.

Examiner

Philip S. Scuderi

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: “going offline” in line 2.

Examiner suggests “goes offline”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 recites the limitation “it going offline” in line 1. It is unclear what “it” is meant to refer to.

Claims 13 and 15 recite the limitations “determining ... imaging devices similar to an imaging device” and “determining ... imaging devices similar to the imaging device” in lines 3-4 and 2-3 respectively. It is unclear which imaging devices are considered “similar to” other imaging devices.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeKonig et al. (U.S. 6,769,022, hereinafter “DeKonig”).

With respect to claim 1, DeKonig teaches an imaging device (Management station 206 is an imaging device because it displays application 208 (i.e. an image).) comprising:

an image generator (a web browser, see figure 5);

a network interface (See figure 2. Management station 206 must have a network interface in order to connect to network 202.); and

a controller coupled to the network interface and the image generator (application 208), wherein the controller is adapted to store a list of other network addresses (See figure 2 and column 7 lines 29-32. The network addresses must be stored in order to access the devices.).

With respect to claim 4, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1, wherein the controller (208) is adapted to store a list of other network addresses in a register (Any place that application 208 stores the network addresses reads on a register.).

With respect to claim 6, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1, wherein the list of other network addresses is in a formatted memory block (Any place that application 208 stores the network addresses reads on a formatted memory block.).

With respect to claim 7, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1, wherein the controller is adapted to discover the list of other network addresses (column 7 lines 17-20).

With respect to claim 9, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 7, wherein discovering the list of other network addresses is scheduled to occur at specific times (at startup, see column 7 lines 17-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeKonig.

With respect to claim 2, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1, wherein the list of other network addresses further comprises a list of other device network addresses (devices 204-1 to

204-N). The other devices are not necessarily imaging devices. However, figure 1 shows a more specific embodiment of such devices. Managed device 104 comprises a server that provides access to managed storage. Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the art to provide servers with monitors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide devices 204 with monitors, thereby enabling network administrators to access the managed devices locally for troubleshooting purposes.

With respect to claim 3, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 2, wherein the list of other imaging device network addresses further comprises imaging device status (column 9 lines 57-62).

With respect to claim 12, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1. DeKonig does not expressly disclose that the web browser of figure 5 has printing capabilities (i.e. is a print engine). Examiner takes Official Notice of the existence of web browsers with printing capabilities at the time of invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to supply the web browser with the ability to print web pages, thereby enabling users to easily transport any information that could be accessed by the web browser (e.g., driving directions, bank statements, etc.).

With respect to claims 13 and 15, DeKonig teaches a computer-usable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for execution by a processor (206) to perform a method comprising:

determining a list of network addresses (See figure 2 and column 7 lines 29-32. The network addresses must be stored in order to access the devices.) for other imaging devices (204) similar to an imaging device (Management station 206 is an imaging device because it displays application 208 (i.e. an image. Management station 206 is similar to devices 204 because the management station and the devices are both capable of connecting to network 202.);

storing the list of network addresses on the imaging device (See column 7 lines 29-32. The network addresses must be stored in order to access the devices.); and

communicating with the other similar devices by referring to the list of network addresses for the other imaging devices (column 7 lines 29-32).

As cited above, the other similar devices are not necessarily imaging devices. However, figure 1 shows a more specific embodiment of such devices. Managed device 104 comprises a server that provides access to managed storage. Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the art to provide servers with monitors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide devices 204 with monitors, thereby enabling network administrators to access the managed devices locally for troubleshooting purposes.

With respect to claims 14 and 16, DeKonig teaches the method of claims 13 and 15, wherein determining the list of network addresses for other imaging devices similar to the imaging device further comprises discovering the network addresses for other imaging devices similar to the imaging device (column 7 lines 17-20).

With respect to claim 19, DeKonig teaches the method of claim 16, further comprising storing imaging device status (column 9 lines 57-62).

Claims 5 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeKonig in view of Venkatraman et al. (U.S. 5,956,487, hereinafter "Venkatraman").

With respect to claim 5, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1. DeKonig does not expressly teach that application 208 (i.e. the controller) comprises an embedded web server. However, DeKonig teaches that the management station software components can be applets (e.g., column 9 lines 5-44). Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the art to provide access to an applet using a web server. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to embed a web server that provides access to the applets. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable user interface access via a variety of communication mechanisms, as was well known in the art (e.g., Venkatraman column 2 lines 27-30).

With respect to claim 20, DeKonig teaches the method of claim 15. DeKonig does not expressly teach that application 208 comprises an embedded web server. However, DeKonig teaches that the management station software components can be applets (e.g., column 9 lines 5-44). Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the art to provide access to an applet using a web server. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to embed a web server that provides access to the applets. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable user interface access via a variety of communication mechanisms, as was well known in the art (e.g., Venkatraman column 2 lines 27-30).

Claims 8, 10, 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeKonig in view of Ferlitsch (U.S. 2002/0089692).

With respect to claim 8, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1. DeKonig is silent with respect to exactly how application 208 originally locates devices 204. It was well known in the art to broadcast a device identification protocol for certain devices to respond to, as evidenced by Ferlitsch. In a similar art, Ferlitsch teaches a device discovery system that broadcasts a device identification protocol for certain devices to respond to (paragraph 0091). Given the teachings of Ferlitsch, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to broadcast a device identification protocol for devices 204 to respond to, thereby enabling application 208 to discover all relevant devices.

With respect to claim 10, DeKonig teaches the imaging device of claim 1. DeKonig is silent with respect to exactly how application 208 originally locates online devices 204. It was well known in the art to ping remote devices that were previously known to be operating on a network to determine whether the devices are currently online, as evidenced by Ferlitsch. In a similar art, Ferlitsch teaches a device discovery system ping remote devices that were previously known to be operating on a network to determine whether the devices are currently online (paragraph 0093 lines 1-6). Given the teachings of Ferlitsch, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to discover devices 204 by pinging devices that were previously known to be operating on network 202, thereby enabling application 208 to obtain the status of the devices (Ferlitsch paragraph 0093 lines 1-9).

With respect to claim 11, DeKonig-Ferlitsch teaches the imaging device of claim 8, wherein the devices respond when they are online.

With respect to claim 17, DeKonig teaches the method of claim 16. DeKonig is silent with respect to exactly how application 208 originally locates online devices 204 (i.e. the selected discover manner). It was well known in the art to broadcast a device identification protocol for certain devices to respond to, as evidenced by Ferlitsch. In a similar art, Ferlitsch teaches a device discovery system that broadcasts a device identification protocol for certain devices to respond to (paragraph 0091). Given the teachings of Ferlitsch, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to broadcast a device identification protocol for devices 204 to respond to, thereby enabling application 208 to discover all relevant devices.

With respect to claim 18, DeKonig-Ferlitsch teaches the method of claim 17, wherein the devices respond when they are online.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS



Dung C. Du
Primary Examiner